UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

In Re: St. Jude Medical, Inc. File No. 01-MD-1396 Silzone Heart Valves (JRT/FLN)

Products Liability Litigation

Minneapolis, Minnesota May 4, 2005 1:39 P.M.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN R. TUNHEIM UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

(STATUS CONFERENCE)

APPEARANCES

For the Plaintiffs: LEVY, ANGSTREICH, FINNEY, BALDANTE, RUBENSTEIN & COREN
STEVEN E ANGSTREICH ESO

STEVEN E. ANGSTREICH, ESQ. 1616 Walnut Street, 18th Floor Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

CAPRETZ & ASSOCIATES JAMES T. CAPRETZ, ESQ. 5000 Birch Street, Suite 2500 Newport Beach, California 92660

ZIMMERMAN REED J. GORDON RUDD, JR., ESQ. DAVID M. CIALKOWSKI, ESQ. 651 Nicollet Mall Suite 501 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

GREEN, SCHAAF & JACOBSON

JOE D. JACOBSON, ESQ. (Via phone) 7733 Forsyth Blvd., Suite 700 St. Louis, Missouri 63105

PATRICK J. MURPHY, ESQ. 1701 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 550 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

For the Defendant: REED, SMITH, CROSBY, HEAFEY STEVEN M. KOHN, ESQ. DAVID E. STANLEY, ESQ. 355 South Grand Avenue Suite 2900

Los Angeles, California 90071

Court Reporter: KRISTINE MOUSSEAU, CRR-RPR 1005 United States Courthouse

300 Fourth Street South

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

(612) 664-5106

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer.

1

18

19

liaison counsel.

- (In open court.) 2 THE COURT: You may be seated, everyone. Good 3 afternoon. 4 MR. ANGSTREICH: Before we go on the record, Your 5 Honor --6 (Off-the-record discussion.) 7 THE COURT: Let's proceed with the hearing today. 8 This is civil case number 01-1396, In Re: St. Jude Medical Silzone Heart Valves Products Liability Litigation. We 9 10 will have counsel note their appearances in just a moment. 11 Let's make sure that we have Mr. Jacobson by telephone. 12 MR. JACOBSON: I'm here. 13 THE COURT: He's there. Okay. We have got him. 14 Okay. Counsel, go ahead. 15 MR. CAPRETZ: Jim Capretz for the plaintiffs. 16 MR. ANGSTREICH: Steven Angstreich for the class. 17 MR. RUDD: Gordon Rudd for the class.
- 20 THE COURT: Good afternoon, gentlemen.
- 21 MR. KOHN: Steve Kohn for St. Jude Medical.

MR. MURPHY: Pat Murphy, plaintiffs' state

- MR. STANLEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. David
- 23 Stanley for St. Jude Medical.
- THE COURT: Good afternoon to both of you. Okay.
- We're here today for a status conference.

- 1 Mr. Capretz, are you going to lead us off?
- 2 MR. CAPRETZ: I am. Nothing too exciting on the
- 3 agenda today, certainly not as interesting probably as your
- 4 current trial. The first matter we had, Your Honor, was
- 5 just a status report on the Eighth Circuit matter.
- 6 Regrettably from our view, we have heard nothing to date,
- 7 so we do not yet have a --
- 8 THE COURT: Still fully briefed, but no hearing?
- 9 MR. CAPRETZ: Still fully briefed, but we are
- waiting. I'm told that you hear typically the first part
- of the month when you have a hearing scheduled, so we're at
- that first part of the month. I don't know if we're past
- 13 the time when we would know.
- 14 THE COURT: Usually they fill out their calendars
- at least a month in advance, don't they, Mr. Rudd? Is
- 16 that --
- MR. RUDD: That's our experience.
- 18 THE COURT: The calendars would now be for the
- 19 June setting. I haven't seen one yet, though, come across.
- 20 Usually we get copies of their hearing calendars as well.
- 21 I don't think I've seen one yet for June. Okay.

| 22 | MR. CAPRETZ: We have told them that we're |
|----|---|
| 23 | prepared to argue at St. Louis or here or wherever they |
| 24 | would like. We would just like our place on the agenda. |
| 25 | THE COURT: That flexibility is probably helpful |

- 1 for them.
- 2 MR. CAPRETZ: Okay. The second matter concerns
- 3 the status of mediations, and I think I will just let Dave
- 4 Stanley address that.
- 5 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Stanley?
- 6 MR. STANLEY: Thank you, Your Honor. Just real
- 7 quickly, we have I believe about 24 pending cases. Five of
- 8 those are class representatives for medical monitoring, so
- 9 19 or so injury cases. Of those we believe six are not
- 10 injury cases. They're just cases that we believe are
- 11 medical monitoring cases that we won't mediate, and then of
- the rest, I believe that Mr. Angstreich and I settled two
- 13 cases this morning, or we're very close.
- We have five other mediations set, and then we
- 15 have in the other cases -- we could go case by case if you
- wanted -- discussions are still ongoing in every case.
- 17 THE COURT: So if those two do indeed settle,
- there is eleven more in that category, then?
- MR. STANLEY: Yes.
- THE COURT: You have mediations set for five of
- 21 the eleven?

| 22 | MR. STANLEY: We have formal mediation set in |
|----|--|
| 23 | five, and then either agreements that we will mediate once |
| 24 | we have collected the necessary medical records. I think |
| 25 | in two cases, the Murphy case and Neece case, that process |

- 1 just began a couple of months ago, and we're still trying
- 2 to collect all the records so we can mediate, and in the
- 3 rest of the cases, I think we have agreed to do what
- 4 Mr. Angstreich and I did this morning, which is try to
- 5 settle these cases but without having a mediator present.
- 6 THE COURT: I see. Okay.
- 7 MR. ANGSTREICH: Your Honor, if I could just say
- 8 one thing. It does look good with respect to two. There
- 9 was a third one. The offer has been discussed with counsel
- 10 in New York that brought the case to us. Counsel is
- 11 recommending that the client accept it. I spoke with the
- 12 client.
- The client is pondering whether to accept it or
- 14 not, and so it's possible that we might have three
- 15 settlements.
- 16 THE COURT: In the pondering phase?
- MR. ANGSTREICH: That's correct, in the pondering
- 18 phase.
- 19 THE COURT: The mediations that are set, the
- 20 five, are they in the month of May, or is it farther out,
- 21 do you know?

- MR. STANLEY: Well, I think they're set in either
- 23 May or June.
- THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. STANLEY: I could give you dates if you

- 1 wanted.
- 2 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. I just wanted to
- 3 make sure that they were relatively soon. Okay. Anything
- 4 else on the mediations? Okay. Mr. Capretz?
- 5 MR. CAPRETZ: I think not at the moment, Your
- 6 Honor. The next agenda item concerns a couple more
- 7 pretrial orders, 44 and 45. These go to further extensions
- 8 in discovery and the expert discovery. I told my
- 9 colleagues that I had to abstain from voting, if you will,
- on or agreeing to these extensions mainly because I have a
- case in -- pending in Ramsey County that is dependent on
- the experts.
- And as a result, we can't go forward, and the
- person is in precarious health condition, but I do
- understand it's taken a long time, this extensive
- discovery, and everyone seems to agree that these are
- 17 appropriate.
- 18 So Steve?
- 19 MR. ANGSTREICH: Your Honor, if I might.
- THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Angstreich.
- MR. ANGSTREICH: We are still attempting to

- 22 gather the AVERT documents. There is one more deposition
- of one of the AVERT investigators that needs to be done.
- 24 There is a deposition next week of the FER person.
- 25 Mr. Jacobson's co-counsel, Mr. Silva, is going to be taking

- 1 that deposition. There is a rescheduled deposition of
- 2 Monica Schultz.
- 3 Do we have a date on that?
- 4 MR. KOHN: No.
- 5 MR. ANGSTREICH: Monica Schultz needs to be done,
- 6 and once the documents are fully and completely collected,
- 7 then we will be in a position to turn them over to our
- 8 experts, along with completing the approximately three
- 9 depositions. We did take the one hour of Ms. Ellingworth's
- 10 deposition. Today I appreciate the Court's giving me that
- 11 one hour.
- I don't know whether I really do appreciate it
- because it was not much better than the four hours I spent
- with her, but that should then bring us to a point where we
- 15 will then be in a position to have the experts. The
- additional 60 days that we discussed with Mr. Stanley, we
- believe it is necessary in order to get all of the
- 18 information together.
- We recognize the need to get the discovery
- 20 completed. All of the individual cases that are still part
- 21 of the MDL they can't get back and they can't go forward

- 22 until we get the generic and expert generic discovery
- 23 completed. So we're well aware of that, but quite frankly,
- 24 we didn't realize the magnitude of the documents that we
- 25 had not gotten through the previous discovery requests.

- 1 And that's being assembled, and as of, I believe,
- 2 today, there was another e-mail sent asking when we might
- 3 expect the remainder of the documents, and I haven't seen a
- 4 response to that.
- 5 THE COURT: So the proposed pretrial orders set
- 6 up what kind of a timing response?
- 7 MR. ANGSTREICH: We're to identify all our
- 8 generic experts by August 15th. The defendants will
- 9 identify their generic experts by September 21st. We'll
- 10 identify rebuttal experts by October 14th. The deposition
- of generic experts will be taken November 1 and February 1,
- 12 and I guess that's the -- the timing that follows, taking
- us out to February 1 of '06.
- The fact, the generic fact discovery is extended
- to July 5, and case specific is extended to August 15. 44
- 16 gives us the extension of generic fact discovery and the
- case specific discovery. 45 takes the expert -- experts
- 18 out.
- 19 THE COURT: Okay. Great. Mr. Stanley or
- 20 Mr. Kohn, anything that you would like to say?
- 21 MR. STANLEY: No, Your Honor. They proposed the

- 22 60 days, and we're all in agreement.
- THE COURT: Okay. So there is no disagreement
- 24 with the proposal, and the only issue is relative to
- 25 Mr. Capretz' concern, correct?

- 1 MR. STANLEY: Correct.
- 2 MR. CAPRETZ: Yeah.
- 3 THE COURT: Okay. Well, the proposed orders look
- 4 to be fine. I would like to move things along as quickly
- 5 as possible, and if we can move these matters even faster
- 6 than what is indicated in there, that would be helpful. If
- 7 you look for any chance to move them a little bit more
- 8 quickly, I think that would be helpful for everyone so we
- 9 can get all of the discovery wrapped up.
- 10 And in particular the experts, I would like to
- 11 get that -- that process moving as quickly as we can.
- Mr. Capretz?
- 13 MR. CAPRETZ: Okay, Your Honor. The last item,
- 14 although I have to say before I was going to add one of
- 15 these last minute items that Mr. Stanley likes to talk
- about, because Mr. Angstreich after the last deposition was
- wondering about one of those eastern European countries
- 18 where the suspects were being taken by the U. S. to be
- interrogated, I guess that's what we were thinking of with
- 20 Ms. Ellingworth to get some better answers.
- 21 THE COURT: They have some methods in Uzbekistan

- that we are trying to get changed, so I'm very familiar
- with them, unfortunately.
- MR. ANGSTREICH: I don't think they would have
- 25 helped, Your Honor.

- 1 MR. CAPRETZ: The last point is the status of the
- 2 Ramsey County and Canadian cases. I think the Court
- 3 received from St. Jude Medical about a week ago an update
- 4 on the calendar. The numbers are the same. I didn't quite
- 5 frankly look to see if the names are different since some
- 6 cases have settled, but the numbers are the same as the
- 7 last report, as well as the numbers pending in the federal
- 8 and state court.
- 9 There is pending in Ramsey County approximately
- 10 25 of the cases. I think our case that I was referring to,
- which is scheduled for the winter of 2005, is the only one
- 12 currently set for trial. That will probably have to be
- pushed back because of the availability of the expert
- 14 testimony.
- 15 And Mr. Angstreich has a pending claim concerning
- 16 the European union claims that were here and transferred to
- 17 Ramsey County.
- THE COURT: And that's been argued and not
- 19 decided yet?
- MR. ANGSTREICH: No. It's been decided, Your
- 21 Honor.

| 22 | THE COURT: | It has? |
|---------|------------|---------|
| <i></i> | THE COURT. | it mas: |

- MR. ANGSTREICH: Yes. Her Honor decided that as
- 24 Your Honor had ruled that it belonged in Minnesota, and it
- 25 will stay in her court. The next step will be a motion for

- 1 class certification, and with respect to the other Canadian
- 2 cases, the notice is going out within approximately three
- 3 weeks for the class in Canada.
- 4 There are approximately seven Canadian cases
- 5 pending in Ramsey County. I think we filed seven, and the
- 6 next step that is going to happen there is that Canada
- 7 potentially has a cap on damages for personal injuries.
- 8 The defendant's position is that that cap is applicable.
- 9 Our position is that it is not applicable here, and it
- 10 probably wouldn't even be applicable in Canada under the
- 11 circumstances for which the cap was created.
- So we are going to be filing a motion to submit
- 13 to the Court to determine whether or not the cap will be
- 14 applied. Regardless of what the ruling is, we believe that
- once there is a ruling, whether there is or there isn't a
- cap that we probably could then settle all of those cases
- 17 as well.
- 18 THE COURT: Okay. Do we know how many
- 19 individuals are receiving the notice in Canada?
- MR. ANGSTREICH: Over 2,000.
- MR. KOHN: No. It's only being issued in the

- 22 province of Ontario, Your Honor, and I think -- it's only a
- ball park -- but somewhere in the neighborhood of 1300 we
- 24 estimate. 2,000 total in all.
- THE COURT: In all of Canada?

- 1 MR. KOHN: In all of Canada.
- 2 THE COURT: But the notice is just going out in
- 3 Ontario right now?
- 4 MR. KOHN: That's correct. There has been a
- 5 mediation in Ontario already.
- 6 MR. ANGSTREICH: There are class actions pending
- 7 in --
- 8 MR. KOHN: British Columbia, Quebec.
- 9 MR. ANGSTREICH: And Ontario, but I thought that
- there was a proposal to mediate in British Columbia.
- MR. KOHN: Possibly in British Columbia.
- MR. ANGSTREICH: That's the status, Your Honor.
- 13 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Capretz?
- MR. CAPRETZ: The only addition to that report,
- as far as the litigation is concerned, the Court will
- recall I think it was set for the fall of 2006, October of
- 17 2006 for a common issues trial if it reaches that point.
- 18 And there was a matter, the class attorneys had applied for
- 19 fees, and St. Jude Medical asked that that be able to be
- appealed, and the Court ruled that it could be appealed, so
- 21 that's the only other issue that is pending in the Canadian

- 22 litigation.
- And with that, that's the only issue I have,
- 24 unless counsel for St. Jude Medical has something.
- THE COURT: Let me just raise an issue, and I'm

- 1 not going to resolve it today. It's just a matter that has
- 2 been raised to me in the -- in one of the individual cases
- 3 that has been settled. It's John and Ann Sutcliffe versus
- 4 St. Jude Medical. It's out of New Jersey.
- 5 A motion has been filed seeking a reopening of
- 6 the action to adjudicate the allocation of settlement
- 7 proceeds apparently triggered by a letter from the Medicare
- 8 Center. Anyone know anything about this at all?
- 9 Mr. Stanley?
- MR. STANLEY: Yeah, I got, yesterday I got a copy
- of the motion that had been filed, and there is a dispute
- 12 over Medicare, and Medicare is making a -- has a lien on
- 13 the settlement, and I was told that the motion was coming
- but that the confidentiality of our settlement wasn't going
- to be breached.
- 16 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. STANLEY: And so I think it's on the calendar
- 18 for a hearing somewhere back in New Jersey, which is where
- 19 the case was originally filed. That's really all I know
- about it.
- 21 THE COURT: Okay. In the -- in the transferor

- 22 district?
- MR. STANLEY: I believe so, in the District of
- New Jersey.
- THE COURT: Do you know anything, Mr. Angstreich?

- 1 MR. ANGSTREICH: No, I didn't know that that had
- 2 happened. Mr. Savio hadn't contacted us.
- THE COURT: Is there anything unusual about
- 4 New Jersey law that affects this?
- 5 MR. ANGSTREICH: No. It's all federal if it's
- 6 Medicare.
- 7 THE COURT: Okay. The motion I have indicates
- 8 that it's here in this district, filed by Mr. Savio. I
- 9 guess I will look more closely at it, and if anyone has any
- 10 thoughts on it, you may file any kind of response. That
- will be helpful.
- Otherwise we will look at it and see whether
- 13 there is anything that the Court needs to take up as
- opposed to the transferor court. Okay. Anything else for
- 15 today? Let's see. When should we next gather? These, I
- think we probably don't need to have a gathering in June.
- 17 Should we meet in July?
- MR. CAPRETZ: That's fine, Your Honor.
- MR. ANGSTREICH: That would be fine.
- THE COURT: Is that okay?
- 21 MR. KOHN: Yes.

| 22 | THE COURT: We surely can in June if anything |
|----|---|
| 23 | comes up that requires us to get together. I am around |
| 24 | most of the month, so it shouldn't be a problem. Let me |
| 25 | look at the July calendar. |

- 1 MR. ANGSTREICH: Your Honor, just to bring up one
- 2 other point. There is a matter that is before the special
- 3 master relating to certain discovery. I don't know how
- 4 that will be resolved, and if the resolution will require
- 5 it being brought to you.
- 6 If that is an issue, then we would hope that you
- 7 would do it by telephone rather than a formal conference.
- 8 THE COURT: We certainly would do it that way.
- 9 It would be better. Okay. In July, are you back in
- 10 Minnesota for anything scheduled in July?
- MR. KOHN: Not so far as we know.
- MR. ANGSTREICH: No.
- 13 MR. CAPRETZ: No, I don't think so.
- 14 THE COURT: We could do sometime the week of the
- 15 11th, perhaps? Is that --
- MR. ANGSTREICH: Having my computer --
- 17 THE COURT: It's having a bad day or a slow day?
- 18 MR. ANGSTREICH: It's --
- 19 THE COURT: Stay away from the week of the 4th,
- which probably runs into more vacations.
- 21 MR. ANGSTREICH: Right.

- THE COURT: Either the week of the 11th or the
- week of the 18th I think would be fine.
- MR. ANGSTREICH: The 20th I know I'm in North
- 25 Carolina, Your Honor.

- 1 MR. CAPRETZ: ATLA has their convention at the
- 2 end of July, so it would be better not at the end. The
- 3 week of the 11th seems to work.
- 4 THE COURT: Tuesday the 12th work?
- 5 MR. ANGSTREICH: I will tell you in one second.
- 6 My calendar is now up.
- 7 MR. JACOBSON: Your Honor, this is Joe. The 11th
- 8 and 12th are not good for me. I'm fine the rest of the
- 9 week.
- THE COURT: How about the 13th?
- MR. JACOBSON: I'm fine the 13th.
- MR. CAPRETZ: What day of the week is that?
- THE COURT: That's a Wednesday.
- MR. ANGSTREICH: That's fine, Your Honor.
- 15 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. CAPRETZ: I do appreciate if the Court allows
- us to make it the 1:30 time so I can catch a flight that
- 18 morning.
- THE COURT: 1:30 is fine. We'll set it for 1:30
- 20 p.m. Wednesday the 13th of July. If we need anything
- 21 earlier, I assume the parties will be in touch, and if we

- 22 have a discovery related issue, we can handle that by
- 23 telephone.
- Okay. Anything else for today? Thank you all
- 25 for being here. Travel well, and we will see you in a

| 1 | couple months. The Court is in recess. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. ANGSTREICH: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 3 | MR. CAPRETZ: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 4 | * * * |
| 5 | I, Kristine Mousseau, certify that the foregoing |
| 6 | is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in |
| 7 | the above-entitled matter. |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | Certified by: |
| 12 | Kristine Mousseau, CRR-RPR |
| 13 | Dated: June 27, 2005 |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |

22232425